

§ 1.79

this section to the prior-filed provisional application, unless previously submitted;

(ii) The surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and

(iii) A statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under paragraph (a)(5)(ii) of this section and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

(b) Where two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application.

(c) If an application or a patent under reexamination and at least one other application naming different inventors are owned by the same person and contain conflicting claims, and there is no statement of record indicating that the claimed inventions were commonly owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person at the time the later invention was made, the Office may require the assignee to state whether the claimed inventions were commonly owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person at the time the later invention was made, and if not, indicate which named inventor is the prior inventor. Even if the claimed inventions were commonly owned, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person, at the time the later invention was made, the conflicting claims may be rejected under the doctrine of double patenting in view of such commonly owned or assigned applications or patents under reexamination.

(Pub. L. 94-131, 89 Stat. 685; 35 U.S.C. 6, Pub. L. 97-247)

[36 FR 7312, Apr. 17, 1971, as amended at 50 FR 9380, Mar. 7, 1985; 50 FR 11366, Mar. 21, 1985; 58 FR 54509, Oct. 22, 1993; 60 FR 20225, Apr. 25, 1995; 61 FR 42804, Aug. 19, 1996; 62 FR 53189, Oct. 10, 1997; 65 FR 14872, Mar. 20, 2000; 65 FR 54669, Sept. 8, 2000; 65 FR 57054, Sept. 20, 2000; 66 FR 67095, Dec. 28, 2001; 68 FR 71006, Dec. 22, 2003; 69 FR 56541, Sept. 21, 2004; 70 FR 3891, Jan. 27, 2005; 70 FR 30365, May 26, 2005]

37 CFR Ch. I (7-1-05 Edition)

§ 1.79 Reservation clauses not permitted.

A reservation for a future application of subject matter disclosed but not claimed in a pending application will not be permitted in the pending application, but an application disclosing unclaimed subject matter may contain a reference to a later filed application of the same applicant or owned by a common assignee disclosing and claiming that subject matter.

THE DRAWINGS

AUTHORITY: Secs. 1.81 to 1.88 also issued under 35 U.S.C. 113.

§ 1.81 Drawings required in patent application.

(a) The applicant for a patent is required to furnish a drawing of his or her invention where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented; this drawing, or a high quality copy thereof, must be filed with the application. Since corrections are the responsibility of the applicant, the original drawing(s) should be retained by the applicant for any necessary future correction.

(b) Drawings may include illustrations which facilitate an understanding of the invention (for example, flow sheets in cases of processes, and diagrammatic views).

(c) Whenever the nature of the subject matter sought to be patented admits of illustration by a drawing without its being necessary for the understanding of the subject matter and the applicant has not furnished such a drawing, the examiner will require its submission within a time period of not less than two months from the date of the sending of a notice thereof.

(d) Drawings submitted after the filing date of the application may not be used to overcome any insufficiency of the specification due to lack of an enabling disclosure or otherwise inadequate disclosure therein, or to supplement the original disclosure thereof for the purpose of interpretation of the scope of any claim.

[43 FR 4015, Jan. 31, 1978, as amended at 53 FR 47808, Nov. 28, 1988]